

### **REMARKS**

In response to the above-identified Office Action, the Applicants amend the application and seek reconsideration thereof. Claims 35-38 have been added. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1, 24 and 30, have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6, 11, 16, 17, 24-34 remain pending in the application.

#### **I. Interview Summary**

An Examiner Interview was conduct on December 12, 2007 with Applicant's attorney, Jonathan Miller, participating. The references upon which the current rejections are based were discussed. The disclosure of the "Ticket to Ride" and "ElectroTix Offers New Visual Approach to Selling Tickets on Internet" was discussed. Subject matter that may distinguish the claims of the present application from both of these claims was also discussed. No agreements were reached. However, the Examiner agreed to review proposed amendments that would be prepared based on the discussion in the Interview.

The Applicants submitted these proposed claims to the Examiner and subsequently discussed the proposed claims with the Examiner on January 4, 2008. The Examiner indicated that generally the proposed claims would overcome the current rejections, but provided suggestions for further modifying or refocusing the claims to improve the likelihood of allowing the case. The Applicants have attempted to amend the claims as suggested by the Examiner.

## II. Claims Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 4, 6, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30-32 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by “Ticket to Ride” by Anderson et al (hereinafter “Ticket”).

To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each of the elements of that claim. In regard, to claim 1, this claim as amended includes the elements of “adding the specific individual seat to a list of selected seats to be displayed in response to the selection.” The cited reference, Ticket, does not disclose this element of amended claim 1. Rather, Ticket fails to describe how the selection of a seat is handled stating only that “[y]ou just enter the row and seat letter you want in a ‘desired seat field’ and your selection is confirmed (as long as it’s available).” However, there is no description as to whether a list of selected seats is created, much less whether such a list is displayed to the user. Thus, the Applicants believe that the cited reference does not teach each of the elements of claim 1, as amended.

Claims 4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to claim 1, these claims are not anticipated by Ticket. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 4 and 6 are requested.

Claims 24 and 30, as amended, includes the elements of “seat information to be displayed responsive to user interaction with a display of the plurality of specific individual seats” and “displaying an indicator of each of the plurality of seats selected by the user; in response to user selection from the plurality of seats,” respectively. Ticket does not disclose these elements of amended claims 24 and 30. No discussion is provided in Ticket indicating any display of seat information that is

responsive to user interaction with a display of the seats. Thus, Ticket does not teach each of the elements of claim 24 and 30. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of claims 24 and 30 are requested.

Claims 26, 27, 29, 31, 32 and 34, depend from claims 24 and 30 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to claims 24 and 30, these claims are not anticipated by Ticket. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of claims 26, 27, 29, 31, 32 and 34 are requested.

### **III. Claims Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 2, 3, 11, 16, 17, 25, 28 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious over Ticket or Ticket in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,797,126 issued to Helbling et al (hereinafter “Helbling”) or “ElectroTix Offers New Visual Approach to Selling Tickets on Internet” from the Business Wire (hereinafter “ElectroTix”).

These claims depend from independent claims 1, 24 and 30, respectively, and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, for the reasons mentioned above, Ticket does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims. Further, the Applicants have reviewed ElectroTix and Helbling, as well as discussed these references with the Examiner in the Examiner Interviews mentioned above, and it appears that these references do not cure the defects of Ticket. Specifically, these references do not teach or suggest the elements of amended claims 1, 24 and 30 including “adding the specific individual seat to a list of selected seats to be displayed in response to the selection,” “seat information to be displayed responsive to user interaction with a display of the plurality of specific individual seats” or “displaying an indicator of each of the plurality of seats selected by the user; in response to user selection from the plurality of seats,” respectively. Thus, these references, combined, do not teach or

suggest each of the elements of the dependent claims 2, 3, 11, 16, 17, 25, 28 and 33. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these claims are requested.

### **III. New Claims**

The Applicants have added new claims 35-38, which each depend from independent claim 1. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above in regard to claim 1, these claims are not anticipated by or obvious over the cited references. In addition, each of these claims further clarifies the generation of a list based on the user selection of seats from a seating chart or the interaction with the seating chart, such as by a mouse-over. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references, but have not been able to discern any part therein that teaches these additional aspects. Accordingly, the Applicants believe these new claims are allowable over the cited references.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the forgoing, it is believed that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Questions regarding this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 1/11, 2008

  
Jonathan S. Miller Reg. No. 48,534

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040  
(310) 207-3800

### CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted online via EFS Web to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on 1-11, 2008.

  
Melissa Stead 1-11, 2008